


in view of the overlapping inventorships involved. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn for this reason at least for resolution on an inter partes basis, rather than applicants filing a Declaration under Rule 131.

Thus, the rejection based on '736 should be withdrawn. The same is also true with respect to WO 94/18983 which was published more than one year prior to November 21, 1996, the filing date of the parent application, Serial No. 08/752,948, but not before March 2, 1993.

As for the double-patenting rejection, any issues raised therein would clearly be most appropriately settled in interference proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Anthony J. Zelano (Reg. No. 27,969)  
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P. C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Direct Dial: (703) 812-5311  
Internet address: [zelano@mwzb.com](mailto:zelano@mwzb.com)

**Filed: June 7, 2000**

AJZ/tal:K:\PAT\Sch\1564c1\amendment.wpd

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**